

Mr. DAVIN. Well, then refer to them.

Mr. LISTER. I was going on to say, Mr. Speaker, that this zealous member from the North-west, this gentleman who is always willing to belittle every one else in this House, this gentleman who thinks that no other member from the Territories is competent to speak as to the interests of the community; has an election coming on, and if the signs are not very deceiving indeed, the strong probabilities are that that gentleman has sat in this House for the last time. When a constituency is served as his constituency has been served—matters affecting the North-west being constantly brought before this House by him, and nothing more done by him than to bring them before the House—it is hardly likely that the people of Assiniboia will be satisfied with such representation as the hon. gentleman gives them here.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit to you, Sir, whether in a question that is before the courts, it is not in contempt of court, and therefore improper in this House, for any hon. gentleman to make statements that are calculated to prejudice the case. I cannot but think that in the case of an election being protested, and that matter being before the court, that it is entirely contrary to everything in the shape of good taste (not to say anything further) for an hon. member in this House to discuss a question of that kind, and to make statements that are calculated to prejudice the position of parties.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it would be improper for an hon. member to make statements which would prejudice before the courts the rights of any litigant, but I can hardly think that the fact of a petition being filed against the return of an hon. member would preclude in this House all reference to the facts of the election.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am speaking of statements made with reference to the result of the trial.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member (Mr. Lister) to speak with reference to the election. I hope the hon. member (Mr. Lister) will refrain from referring to the trial and confine his remarks to the election.

Mr. LISTER. I do not think there is very much doubt as to what the result of the election will be, if the past is to be any indication at all as to the future. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) was supporting a Government in power and as he sits here only by the grace of the vote of the returning officer, it seems to me pretty safe to expect that even that vote would not continue him as a member of the House. Let me refer again to the inconsistent position which the hon. member (Mr. Davin) has al-

Mr. LISTER.

ways taken in the House. Need I refer only to the last session, when on the question of the monopoly in the agricultural implement trade, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) withdrew his motion, so as not to embarrass the Government which he was supporting. If you take up the "Hansard," or the Votes and Proceedings of this House, for the years that the hon. gentleman has been here, I do not think that you will be able to find one session during which the hon. gentleman has not introduced legislation which he supported by his speech, but which he allowed to drop. Motions were brought in here for the purpose of relieving the people of the North-west from the burden of taxation they suffered under, and you will find on almost every occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has spoken in favour of the reduction or abolition of the taxes, but has voted in some instances against such motions, and in other instances he has not voted at all. Look at his position on the binder twine question. You will find that on Mr. Mulock's motion, the first time he spoke in favour of it and voted against it, and the next time on the very same motion he spoke in favour of it and did not vote at all. That is the consistent position which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) has occupied while supporting the late Government. Of course he has a freer hand now, and it is altogether likely, judging from the Order paper, that he will deluge this House with all sorts of motions. Why, if we are to judge from his motions on the Order paper, the world will believe that he is an advocate of free trade, pure and simple. He can be free now. He can support the Conservative party in the House here, and can go to the North-west Territories and say there: "See what I have done for these people. I have moved this motion. I have moved that motion, I have moved the other motion, all in the interest of the people of this country." The hon. gentleman can be consistent now, because he can vote in the way he moves. That is something he could not do before. Fortunately for him, his hands are now untied, and he can play the role of a reformer to his heart's content, and can at the same time appear in the country to be consistent. Now, I suppose it is hardly parliamentary for me to say that the hon. gentleman is not always sincere in the motions he brings before the House. Because it is not parliamentary, I will not make that statement; but it is evident that the electors of his constituency think he is not sincere, or they would have returned him by a much larger majority. However, one thing is clear, and that is, as I said before, that this Government has pledged itself to promote in every way possible the interests of that country; and there is in this House a gentleman from that country who occupies an independent position, but who, I venture to say, will always be found, by speech and by action, support-